



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,211	09/28/2001	Karl H. Allen	042390P11777	7896

7590 08/09/2004

James Y. Go
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

GREENE, DANIEL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/967,211

Applicant(s)

ALLEN, KARL H.

Examiner

Daniel L. Greene

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/8/2004.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maes et al. U.S. Patent, 6,016,476 [Maes].

Maes does not expressly show health-related transactions or healthcare devices but does disclose that the present invention [6,016,476] can be used by medical doctors. Col. 11, lines 55-57.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The receiving a request to perform a transaction from a portable device to a remote site, receiving biometric data, determining validity of information associated with a user, and if valid, sending enabling information to perform the transaction steps would be performed the same regardless of whether the transaction was health related, business related, etc. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receiving a request to perform a transaction from a portable device to a remote site, receiving biometric data, determining validity of information associated with a user, and if valid, sending enabling information to perform the transaction steps would be done regardless if it was health or business related because such modifiers do not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the modifiers do not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

3. As per claims 1, 10, 17, and 26:

Maes discloses:

receiving a request from a portable device to perform a transaction in real-time across a network pathway from the portable device to a remote information site; Col. 8, lines 10-67.

receiving biometric data from the portable device', Col. 8, lines 10-67.

determining whether corresponding biometric data is stored; Col. 10, lines 49-67.

if corresponding biometric data is stored, determining validity of credential information associated with a user; Col. 10, lines 49-67.

if the credential information is valid, sending to the portable device, enabling information for performing the transaction. Col. 10, lines 49-67.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claims 2, 11, and 18:

Maes further discloses:

wherein the request includes login information to initiate a session and the enabling information includes session information. Col. 9-10, lines 1-67.

As per claims 3, 12, and 19:

Maes further discloses:

wherein the determining of validity of credential information includes sending a request for a credential check to a credential service and receiving a credential check result from the credential service. Col. 10, lines 18-30.

As per claims 4, 13, 20, and 27:

Maes further discloses:

including requiring the login information after a pre-designated time period of inactivity. Col. 8, lines 25-30.

As per claims 5, 14, 21, and 28:

Maes further discloses:

wherein the enabling information includes the credential information for forwarding to the remote information site. Col. 8, lines 1-67.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claims 6, 15, and 22:

Maes further discloses:

wherein the determining of validity of credential information includes comparing the credential information to previously determined credential information for a current session. Col. 8, lines 1-67.

As per claims 7, 16, 23, and 29:

Maes discloses the claimed invention except for wherein the biometric data includes voice data, digital electronic signature data, fingerprint image data, or eye image data. However, Maes does teach about the use of biometric data to provide biometric verification of the user. Col. 3, lines 18-21.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include wherein the biometric data includes voice data, digital electronic signature data, fingerprint image data, or eye image data since it is known in the art that wherein the biometric data includes voice data, digital electronic signature data, fingerprint image data, or eye image data.

As per claims 8 and 24:

Maes further discloses:

wherein if corresponding biometric data is not stored, further including denying the requested health-related transaction. Col. 12, lines 50-55.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claims 9 and 25:

Maes discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of wherein the receiving biometric data occurs at pre-designated intervals of time. However, Maes does teach about the timing of when certain actions and responses occur. Since the applicant has not disclosed that wherein the receiving biometric data occurs at pre-designated intervals of time solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Maes will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any means, method, or product to wherein the receiving biometric data occurs at pre-designated intervals of time.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Scott et al. U.S. 6,484,260 PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

5. Diehl et al. U.S. 6,317,544 DISTRBUTED MOBILE BIOMETRIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM WITH A CENTRALIZED SERVER AND MOBILE WORKSTATION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Greene whose telephone number is 703-306-5539. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 8am-6pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

7/28/2004

DLG



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600